



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Like Golther, Wolzogen in his neat and attractively illustrated booklet aims to be suggestive and to foster an understanding of the poet Wagner, rather than to give a detailed discussion of his work. As might be expected, Wolzogen, too, is under the influence of Bayreuth and exhibits at times the tendency all too common among Wagnerites of leaving the firm ground of reality and soaring into the clouds of abstract and hazy laudation. He is a partisan of Bayreuth, even where the Bayreuth idea would seem to conflict with that of Wagner himself. Page 32, for example, he praises the gradual transformation from the Venus grotto to the vale of the Wartburg, as given in 1904 at Bayreuth. But Wagner's own stage directions read: "Furchtbarer Schlag, Venus verschwindet, Tannhäuser steht plötzlich in einem schönen Thale." Wolzogen also brings out clearly (page 93) the danger so often incurred of criticising the poet Wagner on the basis of his language alone. With Wagner "speech is not the only means of expression but the art form is determined by the æsthetic effect of speech plus music." In conclusion, Wolzogen brings together very strikingly, Goethe's poetic expression in the verses of the Pater Ecstaticus in *Faust*, and that of Wagner in Isolde's Love-Death in *Tristan*, showing that even without music, Wagner's poetry has sometimes a deep inner relationship to that of the great master of all German poets.

PAUL R. POPE.

Cornell University.

THE DIABLO COJUELO DE LUIS VÉLEZ DE GUEVARA.¹

Eight years ago Señor Bonilla y San Martín published his first edition of Vélez de Guevara's *Diablo cojuelo*.² Many flattering reviews, written by leading Spanish scholars, proclaimed the work to be a solid and scholarly production.³ This

¹ Luis Vélez de Guevara, *El diablo cojuelo* (ed. A. Bonilla y San Martín, Madrid, 1910). The second volume of the new series published under the auspices of the *Sociedad de bibliófilos madrileños*.

² Librería de Eugenio Krapf, Vigo, 1902.

³ Among others, cf. those of Rennert, *Mod. Lang. Notes*,

edition has long been out of print and it is a matter of congratulation that the *Sociedad de bibliófilos madrileños* decided to reprint the text in their new series. The first edition contained several errors of detail, as was but natural in view of the many difficulties offered by the language and style of the *Diablo cojuelo*, admittedly one of the obscurest works of the period. The editor himself corrected some of these and contributed new material for the commentary in later publications.⁴ Felipe Pérez y González, too, more than any other reviewer, aided in the solving of many of the knottiest problems.⁵ In the present volume, Bonilla profits both by the criticism of his reviewers and by his own maturer study. Consequently, the second edition is decidedly better than the first. Nearly all the errors have been corrected, and the copious notes leave unexplained very few of the difficulties of the text.

The introduction shows that Bonilla, profiting by the criticisms of Pérez y González, has radically altered his statement as to the date when the *Diablo cojuelo* was written. In his first edition, the former advanced the opinion that Vélez began work on his novel about 1630 and finished it after the month of February, 1637. Pérez y González reached the conclusion that the work was begun after February, 1638, and finished before May, 1639.⁶ This was much nearer the truth; but Bonilla, returning to the fray, has shown with much plausibility that the novel was begun after February, 1637, and finished about July, 1640, or two months before the signing of the *aprobación*. It is unnecessary to consider in detail the steps by which Bonilla reaches this conclusion. Suffice it to say that the result now published appears to be substantially accurate.

However, one allusion in the *Diablo cojuelo*, which may have a direct bearing on this question of date, has not, in the opinion of the reviewer,

June, 1904; Foulché-Delbosc, *Rev. hisp.*, Vol. ix, p. 595; Morel-Fatio, *Bull. hisp.*, 1903; Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *The Sat. Rev.*, September, 1902.

⁴ Cf. *Rev. de arch.*, April, 1902; *Anales de la literatura española* (Madrid, 1904), pp. 193-200.

⁵ Felipe Pérez y González, *El diablo cojuelo, notas y comentarios* (Madrid, 1903). Most of the material in this little volume first appeared in the columns of *La ilustración española y americana*.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

received the attention which it properly merits. I allude to the mention of the play *Troya abrasada* in *Tranco IV*. The novel abounds in allusions to contemporary happenings, and most of these *actua-lidades* have been carefully studied by the two scholars who have chiefly occupied themselves with this complicated question. It is worth inquiring whether or not, in alluding to this play, Vélez is referring to a theatrical production which commanded public attention at the moment when he wrote.

Bonilla mentions the manuscript of a play of this name existing in the National Library in Madrid, and which, in the *Catálogo* of Paz y Melia is attributed to Calderón; but he makes no detailed study of the play itself, simply referring to the *censuras* at the end of the ms. No mention is made of the other mss. and prints accessible in the Biblioteca municipal. He presents no study of the question of the date when *Troya abrasada* was written or produced. He merely states that the first *censura* which has been preserved shows that the play was acted in the year 1644 and that this production was a revival and not the original performance.

Space does not here permit a thorough consideration of the question of the dating of *Troya abrasada*. I hope to treat the matter more at length in another connection. Only a few facts can here be presented. The autograph ms. contains a *reperto*, in Calderón's own hand, giving the names of the actors who probably first produced the play. One of these is Pedro Manuel de Castilla, who is known to have died at Naples in 1642.⁷ Furthermore, most of the actors seem to have belonged to the companies of Antonio de Rueda and Manuel Vallejo, who were associated as partners in and around Madrid during the summer of 1639.⁸ Nearly all the other actors in the cast can be shown to have been in Madrid in 1639. On the 27th of July, 1639, Antonio de Rueda signed a contract with a representative of the Montería of Sevilla to appear in that city by

the first day of November following for a protracted engagement.⁹ He furthermore agreed to leave Madrid before the end of July for the city of Granada.¹⁰ Manuel Vallejo's troupe accompanied that of Rueda south, and for the next two years the most important members of our cast were acting in the neighborhood of Sevilla. Now, Antonio de Rueda produced other plays by Calderón while at Madrid in the year 1639.¹¹ The fact that the *reperto* was written in Calderón's hand makes it probable that the play was first produced in Madrid or its environs, and everything tends to show that its date should be fixed at some time prior to August 1, 1639, by which time Antonio de Rueda had contracted to be on his way to Granada.

It is almost certain that *Troya abrasada* was written or produced very nearly at the moment when Vélez was writing his *Diablo cojuelo*, or at all events prior to that time, and, while admitting the possibility that there may have been another play of the same name, I cannot but regard this coincidence of dates as significant. The description which the poet of the inn gives of his play is, on the whole, a very good caricature of Calderón's piece. Some allowance must be made for the exaggeration of burlesque, for it would be absurd to expect a pedantically accurate description of a play which is being ridiculed.

The question now arises as to whether Vélez was satirizing Calderón in his caricature of the half-crazy poetaster. Bonilla has considered this possibility and very sanely answers the query in the negative. Beyond the fact that the poet is urged to give over writing *comedias de ruido* and to stick to *comedias de capa y espada*, there is little in the portrait which might well be construed as a possible allusion to Calderón. There is, however, another possibility. Bonilla is unaware that the play is the joint work of two authors and that on the cover of Act I appears the name Juo. Zaualeta.¹² Señor Paz y Melia assures me there

⁷ *Histrionismo*, p. 317.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 319.

¹¹ Cf. *Documentos*, p. 120; Rennert, *The Spanish Stage*, p. 586.

¹² This point escaped my notice at first. I wish therefore to correct the statement made in the *Rev. hisp.*, Vol. XXI, p. 169, to the effect that *Troya abrasada* is entirely the work of Calderón. A more careful study of the ms. and text has caused me to change my opinion.

⁷ Cf. Sánchez-Arjona, *Noticias referentes á los anales del teatro en Sevilla* (Sevilla, 1899), p. 299. In a document signed July 6, 1639, this actor is mentioned as a joint *autor* with Rueda. Cf. Pérez Pastor, *Histrionismo español* (Madrid, 1901), p. 316.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 314; *Documentos para la bibliografía de Calderón*, pp. 120 f.

can be no doubt but that Acts II and III are written entirely in the hand of Calderón. He is equally certain that neither of the two hands which appear in Act I is that of Zabaleta. Neither is the name Zabaleta that author's own signature. The first act is apparently a *traslado* made by copyists. Nevertheless, there is little reason to doubt that Zabaleta was the author of Act I when his name appears in what was undoubtedly the original ms. It is not impossible that Zabaleta was commonly reputed to be the sole author of the piece. Calderón did not claim *Troya abrasada* as his own when he compiled for the Duke of Veragua the list of his comedias. In this instance he probably was rendering good-natured assistance to a youthful aspirant, just as in his younger days he had been glad to collaborate with dramatists of the older generation.¹³

Now, it is just possible that Zabaleta may have been the butt of Vélez's satire. The poet at the inn was a student from Madrid. Zabaleta was a native of the capital, and, if Barrera is justified in placing the date of his birth in the second decade of the century, he was still a young man when Vélez wrote. We know that he was making his début as a dramatist at about this time. Two of the poetaster's plays had been hissed off the stage at Toledo. We know that at least one of Zabaleta's met a similar fate. The fiasco of *Aun vive la honra en los muertos* inspired Cáncer's often quoted epigram :

Al suceder la tragedia
del silvo, si se repara,
ver su comedia era cara,
ver su cara era comedia.

As this piece was not written until 1643, there can be no allusion to it here.¹⁴ But where there was one failure there may have been others. With the exception of Act I of *Troya abrasada*, the play referred to is the earliest of Zabaleta's works that has been preserved. He may have

written still earlier works which failed on the stage.

On the other hand, it is quite as probable that Vélez had in mind no particular dramatic author. He may have been ridiculing writers of sensational plays as a class. The poet at the inn, besides *Troya abrasada*, had written a play named the *Marqués de Mantua*, another called *El saco de Roma*, and still another entitled *Las tinieblas de Palestina*.¹⁵ If it could be shown that one author had written four plays with these titles, he would manifestly be the original of the portrait. In the absence of such decisive evidence, one can only conclude that while Vélez, in the passage in question, may be satirizing Zabaleta or another, the fact remains unproven. It is much more probable, though, that the *Troya abrasada* alluded to was the play written jointly by Calderón and Zabaleta, a work which in spite of the ridicule heaped upon it held the boards for the better part of two centuries. It was acted at the *Coliseo de la cruz* as late as November 5, 1811.¹⁶

Bonilla's notes to this edition are exceedingly copious, comprising 132 pages. He keeps his promise of sinning on the side of prolixity rather than on that of brevity. One is somewhat surprised to see singled out for comment such common words as: *alcandaras*, *blanca*, *cal*, *caca*, *pajarote*, etc. Surely these are to be found in the ordinary dictionary. To a foreign reader, such phrases as *un nuevo Tostado en verso* and others which might be mentioned seem more deserving of comment, even though they, too, offer no difficulties which are not solved by the usual books of reference. But the personal equation enters into all such matters, and the editor justly observes that what appears simple to him may seem difficult to another and vice versa. It is a matter of more regret that the notes have not been systematically classified. They are arranged alphabetically, but

¹⁵ Lope wrote a *Marqués de Mantua*, Juan de la Cueva, *El saco de Roma*. Nothing is known of the last-named play, but Bonilla points out (p. 230) that the episode of the rending of the veil of the Temple takes place in Damián Salustio's *La vida y muerte de Judas*.

¹⁶ Cf. Cotarelo y Mori, *Historia del arte escénico en España* (Madrid, 1902), Vol. III, p. 734. That the *Troya abrasada* there referred to is the identical play under consideration is proved by the fact that the actors' copy used on that occasion is still preserved in the Biblioteca municipal.

¹³ The reader will remember that Calderón and Zabaleta also collaborated in writing *La margarita preciosa*. As Calderón rarely collaborated with others younger than himself, the fact that he twice did so with Zabaleta would seem to imply that he had an especial fondness for that author.

¹⁴ Cf. Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, p. 600.

instead of listing them under the leading word, Bonilla often chooses the first word of a phrase and places the note accordingly. For instance, the reader seeking information with regard to the play *Las tinieblas de Palestina* would hardly think of searching under the head of the pronoun *se*. The note to the play *Troya abrasada* is listed under *t*. That treating of the *Marqués de Mantua* appears under *c*, the first word of the phrase being *comedia*. This system, or lack of system, renders unnecessarily difficult of access much valuable information.

In a few instances, Bonilla's second thoughts do not seem to be so good as his first. In his former edition, for example, he explains the phrase *un nitesgut español* by suggesting what appears to be the obvious etymology: *nichts gut*. Pérez y González objected to this that the speaker was an Englishman, not a German, and that the meaning suggested by Bonilla would be an absurd anticlimax, coming after the far stronger objurgations of the Frenchman and the Italian.¹⁷ To this Bonilla made answer that Guevara probably understood almost nothing of either English or German.¹⁸ (The German remains dumb during the polyglot altercation.) This would seem a very sensible and likely explanation, but he now abandons it and boldly proposes the etymology: naughty guest. Of course, we are to give to naughty the strong meaning which it still retained when Shakespeare and Vélez wrote. Nevertheless, the etymology will appear plausible to few English-speaking readers. It is to be hoped that this trifle will not come to the notice of a certain Mantuan bachelor, Alonso de San Martín. That waggish critic would make the most of his opportunity.

In these days when the Biblioteca nacional and the Spanish Academy are under fire, one is not surprised to find an echo of the conflict in a work like the present. To Bonilla the Academy is as the *muleta* to the bull. His more recent writings have been filled with truculent attacks upon that venerable institution. Academies admittedly have their limitations, and private enterprise often leaves official endeavor lagging; but the world of letters has much for which to thank the Spanish

Academy. Bonilla might profitably read, in the *Opinions de Jérôme Coignard*, Anatole France's whimsical estimate of the French Academy. On the other hand, it is encouraging to note that Spaniards generally are demanding something better in the way of a dictionary. If ever good workman is justified in complaining of his tools, Bonilla is thoroughly justified in his attack upon the academy dictionary, that most inadequate aid in time of trouble. In a recent number of *España moderna*, Cejador y Frauca called the attention of his countrymen to the fact that since the publication of the *Diccionario de autoridades* next to nothing has been done by their dictionary makers in the way of systematic reading for new words and examples. That work, which was intended merely as a beginning has not been continued, he says, and subsequent lexicographers have worked it as a quarry without themselves adding to its store. It is to be hoped that some good will result from the present agitation and that each new Spanish dictionary will cease to be a copy of its predecessors. Bonilla's editions of the *Diablo cojuelo* offer the lexicographer of the future much valuable material. If the present reviewer has dwelt too exclusively upon *pecadillos*, it only argues his inability to detect serious *pecados*. The merits are taken for granted.

GEORGE TYLER NORTHUP.

Princeton University.

GERMAN ROMANTICISM.

Deutsche Romantik. Eine Skizze von Dr. OSKAR F. WALZEL. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1908. 168 pp.

Die Poetik der deutschen Romantiker, von CHR. D. PFLAUM. Berlin, Deutscher Schriftenverlag, 1909. 70 pp.

Die ältere Romantik und die Kunst des jungen Goethe, von Dr. HANS RÖHL. Berlin, Alexander Duncker Verlag, 1909. 164 pp.

Das romantische Drama. Eine Studie über den Einfluss von Goethes Wilhelm Meister auf das Drama der Romantiker, von KARL GEORG

¹⁷ Pérez y González, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

¹⁸ *Anales*, p. 199.